

Why begin new limitations on something that already has sufficient regulations to serve the common good?

Comparison – communications

1. Satellite - Radio has been available to any with a receiver and free since day one of broadcasting. There could possibly be less regulation to send a satellite into orbit and regulate the resulting broadcast and reception. With radio there is no clutter by actual objects.
2. Internet – As with radio, there are some regulations necessary. In radio the track record does not indicate any additional limitations and regulations that result in restriction that forces existing stations to close or take on additional costs.
3. Technology – Let technology serve, as in un-manned station time. The existing stations should be allowed to continue to function with the stations they have. They played by the rules to get this far, what is the point in putting them out of business and not make any all-inclusive and/or beneficial advancement to the common good (example: the upcoming digital-analog switch is not putting any stations out of business)?

Logic - What are the powers of the Community Advisory Boards and why are they suddenly necessary? Advising can be benign and therefore not necessary or if forced to prove the Board is necessary and make changes just to make changes un-justified. Are the advisors going to advance in Government with experience in this field? Job experience is beneficial, but in this instance it is a thin and limited benefit.

Competition in the market place – If you start requiring a business to add more employees and not have the corresponding demand and sales to offset the increased payroll, you are killing the business. This could allow even more stations to be owned and operated by other interests trying to bypass the current regulations.

I enjoy KLOVE radio and rely on the broadcasts on a daily basis to hear uplifting and Christian music. I am happy to contribute by fund raising efforts by the station interspersed through the year. Apparently, there are enough others that do the same that KLOVE has been able to play by existing rules and provide this unique service - only in America. Any additional regulations by additional boards that endanger this station and any other station currently providing broadcasts for a variety of interests, gets my no vote. I agree to the following:

**Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233**

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

I urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Roxanne McConnell
roxiemcconnell@gmail.com

04-23-08
818 E Cedar Ct #C, Fruita CO 81521
970-858-3189